

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

APPLICANT:	S. Fujii et al.	CONF. NO.:	3017
U.S. SERIAL NO.:	10/068,414	EXAMINER:	B. Menberu
FILED:	February 6, 2002	GROUP:	2625
FOR:	IMAGE SENDING METHOD AND IMAGE SENDING DEVICE		

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

**RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION**

Applicants are in receipt of the Office Action dated January 24, 2008 of the above-referenced application. Applicants respond to the Office Action as follows.

Claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-16, and 18-20 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-16, and 18-20 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,488,483 to Murayama in view of U.S. Patent 6,614,551 to Peek. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Regarding the rejection of independent claims 1, 7, and 13 over the proposed combination of Murayama in view of Peek, the proposed combination does not teach or suggest an image sending method or image sending device including: "setting an image quality for the image data to be sent," or "setting a resolution corresponding to the selected image quality," as recited in independent claim 1 (*see also* independent claims 7 and 13).

Murayama teaches the ability to select either the G4 facsimile protocol or color, and also select either standard resolution (200dpi x 200dpi) or precision resolution (400dpi x 400dpi).

Murayama simply does not teach or suggest the separate steps of "setting an image quality for the image data to be sent," and "setting a resolution corresponding to the selected image quality," as claimed.

As claimed, "resolution" and "image quality" are different properties. Murayama merely discloses selecting from one of two resolutions (standard resolution, precision resolution). Murayama does not teach or suggest processing image data based on "image quality."

The Peek reference does not remedy the above-noted deficiencies of Murayama.

Referring to column 6, lines 1-37 of Peek, a fax machine determines whether a transmission will be a fax transmission or an email transmission by checking for email addresses and fax addresses, as shown in boxes 350 and 360, respectively, of FIG. 4A (see column 6, lines 1-14). In Peek, the fax machine is operable as either a standard fax machine (see column 6, lines 15-16), or as a personal computer for transmitting email (see column 7, lines 24-27).

Peek discloses a fax machine that can be manipulated in different modes. However, there is no teaching or suggestion of "setting an image quality for the image data to be sent," and "selecting and setting a resolution corresponding to the selected image quality," as claimed.

For at least the reasons discussed above, the proposed combination of Murayama in view of Peek does not teach or suggest the Applicants' claimed invention. Therefore, independent claims 1, 7, and 13 and their respective dependent claims are patentable over the proposed combination.

It is believed the application is in condition for immediate allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/Steven M. Jensen/

Date: March 20, 2008

---

Steven M. Jensen  
(Reg. No. 42,693)  
Edwards Angell Palmer & Dodge  
P.O. Box 55874  
Boston, MA 02205

Phone: (617) 239-0100  
Customer No. 21874